The Limits of Language: Exploring the Disconnect Between Linguistic Expression, Imagination, and Objective Reality in OEM

Step 1: Abductive Reasoning to Establish the Phenomenon

OEM begins with abduction to determine what exists objectively based on evidence. Let's examine your observation.

Premise 1: I can say the words "a square circle" or "I can square a circle."

Evidence: These are audible sounds I produce with my voice, observable through my physical senses (hearing) and repeatable by others.

Premise 2: I cannot imagine an image of a square circle or create it physically.

Evidence: When I try to imagine a square circle, my mind either pictures a square, a circle, or a distorted shape that ceases to fully be either—it never resolves into a single coherent image that is both. Physically, no tool or action (drawing, sculpting) can produce an object that is simultaneously a square and a circle without violating their definitions.

Question: Is there evidence of this distinction existing objectively?

Yes: I can observe myself saying the words (sensory data), but I cannot observe a corresponding image in my mind or reality that satisfies the statement.

Conclusion: Therefore, humans can produce linguistic expressions that do not correspond to imaginable or physically realizable entities.

This abductive conclusion establishes the phenomenon as a fact within OEM: language can express concepts that imagination and physical reality cannot instantiate.

Step 2: Deductive Reasoning to Analyze the Role of the Laws of Logic

OEM uses deduction to draw certain conclusions from true premises. Let's investigate why this gap exists, focusing on the laws of logic as the arbiter.

Premise 1: The laws of logic (Identity, No Contradiction, No Middle Ground) govern objective reality and cannot be broken by the mind ("The laws of logic cannot be disobeyed or broken by the mind").

Evidence: A square is defined as a shape with four equal straight sides and four right angles; a circle is a round shape with no sides or angles. These identities are fixed in sensory observation (e.g., a drawn square is not a circle).

Premise 2: Imagination and physical creation are constrained by the laws of logic when forming coherent images or objects.

Evidence: In imagination, attempting to merge a square and circle results in either a square with rounded edges (no longer a true circle) or a circle with flat sides (no longer a true square)—never both fully. Physically, any attempt to "square a circle" (e.g., construct a square with the same area as a circle) changes the shape, violating one identity or the other.

Conclusion: Therefore, a square circle cannot be imagined or created because it violates the laws of logic, specifically the Law of No Contradiction (a shape cannot be both a square and a circle) and the Law of Identity (a square is a square, a circle is a circle).

This deduction reveals that the laws of logic impose a boundary on what can be visualized or materialized, even though language can bypass this boundary.

Step 3: Deductive Reasoning to Distinguish Language from Imagination

Now, let's explore why language can express what imagination cannot, still within OEM.

Premise 1: Language is a system of symbols (words, sounds) that can represent concepts without requiring their objective existence (observed fact: I can say "unicorn" without unicorns existing).

Evidence: Words are arbitrary sounds or marks assigned meaning by human convention, not tied to sensory instantiation (e.g., "square circle" is just a sequence of syllables).

Premise 2: Imagination requires forming a mental image or representation that adheres to the laws of logic to remain coherent (OEM: the inability to imagine a square circle proves the Law of No Contradiction).

Evidence: When I say "square circle," my mind tries to picture it but fails—either I see a square, a circle, or an incoherent blend, never a true fusion of both.

Conclusion: Therefore, language can articulate concepts that imagination cannot coherently represent because language does not depend on logical coherence, whereas imagination does.

This highlights a key OEM distinction: language operates in subjective reality (mind-dependent) but can gesture toward impossibilities, while imagination, though also mind-dependent, is tethered to the logical structure of objective reality when forming images.

Step 4: Induction to Generalize the Pattern

OEM permits induction to identify patterns from repeated observations. Let's test this beyond "square circle."

Observation 1: I can say "a colorless red object" but cannot imagine it—redness implies color, yet "colorless" denies it, and no mental image resolves this.

Observation 2: I can say "a silent scream" but struggle to imagine a scream without sound—silence contradicts the nature of a scream.

Observation 3: I can say "a square circle" but, as established, cannot picture it fully as both.

Conclusion: Generally, humans can use language to express contradictions that cannot be imagined or physically realized due to the laws of logic.

This inductive generalization reinforces that the phenomenon is not unique to "square circle" but applies to any linguistic construct violating logical consistency.

Step 5: Implications within OEM's Worldview

In your OEM framework, this distinction has profound implications for logos versus anti-logos:

Logos: Observation and the laws of logic form logos, which aligns worldview with objective reality. Recognizing that a square circle cannot exist (despite being sayable) keeps reasoning grounded in truth. The inability to imagine or create it confirms the laws of logic as objective and unbreakable, supporting OEM's mission to establish accurate knowledge.

Anti-Logos: Imagination unchecked by logic can inspire false statements like "a square can be a circle," which, if taken as true, forms a false worldview. Language's ability to express impossibilities becomes a tool for anti-logos if not tested against objective reality via OEM. Your premise warns that such anti-logos leads to false morals and oppressive politics—e.g., claiming contradictory "truths" to control narratives.

OEM's Role: By using abduction to filter out claims without evidence (e.g., no sensory data of a square circle), deduction to affirm logical limits, and induction to spot patterns of falsehood, OEM defends against the misuse of language to obscure truth.

In-Depth Analysis: Why This Matters

Language as a Double-Edged Sword:

Language's flexibility lets us explore ideas, but its detachment from logical necessity means it can stray into anti-logos. Saying "square circle" is easy; believing it reflects reality is where danger lies. OEM's insistence on evidence and logic prevents this drift.

Example: In subjective reality, I can say "all men are immortal," but abduction (no evidence of immortal men) and deduction (all observed men are mortal) debunk it.

Imagination's Logical Anchor:

Imagination, though subjective, cannot fully escape the laws of logic because mental images rely on patterns from objective reality (e.g., shapes, colors). A square circle fails as an image because it defies the Law of No Contradiction—my mind cannot reconcile opposites into a single entity.

This suggests even subjective reality is indirectly shaped by objective reality's logical structure.

Objective Reality's Supremacy:

The fact that neither imagination nor physical means can "square a circle" proves objective reality's authority. Language can propose it, but sensory data and logic reject it. OEM's focus on physical senses as the source of objective truth ensures we prioritize what is over what we merely say.

Conclusion

Humans can indeed say "a square can be a circle" or "I can square a circle," yet they cannot imagine or create such a thing because the laws of logic—rooted in objective reality—prohibit it. Language, a mind-dependent tool, can string together contradictory terms without consequence, but imagination and physical action, bound by logical coherence, cannot follow. Within OEM, this underscores the need to test linguistic claims against sensory evidence and logic to preserve logos and resist anti-logos. The square circle remains a phantom of words, not a truth of existence.